DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 995 SP 033 136

AUTHOR Berry, David M.; And Others
TITLE The Process and Product of Portfolio Construction.
PUB DATE 6 Apr 91
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; Consortia; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *Portfolios (Background Materials); Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Central State University OH; *Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development; Reflective Teaching; University of Dayton OH; Wright State University OH

ABSTRACT

The Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development was established in 1988 as an interinstitutional research effort to integrate portfolio development into teacher education. In addition, a sub-phase focused on portfolio use by entry year teachers in a metropolitan school system. The three founding universities, located in southwestern Ohio, are: Central State University, the University of Dayton, and Wright State University. Preliminary findings indicate strong student support for portfolio development commencing in the sophmore year. Evidence also suggests that portfolios are of help in developing classroom management skills, content pedagogy, command of subject matter, student-specific pedagogy, and professional responsibility. The results suggest a need for further research relative to administrative uses for staff recruitment, selection, and professional development. A brief description of each university's approach to implementing the portfolio process in its teacher education program and a portfolio executive summary (draft) are included. (27 references) (Author/IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332995

THE PROCESS AND PRODUCT OF PORTFOLIO CONSTRUCTION

Paper presented at the

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

National Conference, Chicago, Illinois
April 6, 1991

David M. Berry
June A. Kisch
Charles W. Ryan
James K. Uphoff
Wright State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funded by: Wright State Presidential Grant Funds
and
The Carnegie Foundation

SP 033 136

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.W. Ryan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

The Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development was established in 1988 as an interinstitutional research effort to integrate portfolio development into teacher education. In addition, a sub-phase focused on portfolio use by entry year teachers in a metropolitan school system. The three founding universities are located in southwestern Ohio: Central State University, the University of Dayton, and Wright State University. Preliminary findings indicate strong student support for portfolio development commencing in the sophomore year. Evidence also suggests portfolios are of help in developing classroom management skills, content pedagogy, command of subject matter, student-specific pedagogy and professional responsibility. The results suggest a need for further research relative to administrative uses for staff recruitment, selection and professional development.

THE PROCESS AND PRODUCT OF PORTFOLIO CONSTRUCTION

In this presentation we present the results of a collaborative effort to develop the reflective abilities of teacher education students and first-year teachers through the use of portfolios. A total of three universities and one urban school system formed the Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development (OCPD): Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio; the University of Dayton; Wright State University in Dayton; and the Dayton (Ohio) City School System. The project was organized in response to an invitation by Lee Shulman, Director of the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) located at Stanford University, to develop a process for increasing reflectivity skills of first year teachers. We began this effort in introductory education courses during the 1987-88 academic year. Our decision to include this effort in education courses is consistent with current practices in teacher education and to introduce the portfolio process in the sophomore year. Early introduction permits students to analyze, synthesize, integrate, and critique values, beliefs, and concepts related to teaching. They gain a fuller sense of self and of the institutions in which they hope to teach. The Teacher Assessment Project requested that selected universities and school systems (especially those with significant minority enrollments) examine the validity of alternative modes of teacher assessment and their potential impact on teacher education and teacher induction programs. The Ohio Consortium decided to focus its energies on portfolio development.

In January, 1988, TAP began working on assessment procedures for the teaching of literacy in elementary schools and biology in secondary schools. To complement the project's work in assessment centers, where teachers simulate teaching activities, TAP also concentrated on "portfolio" procedures, in which teachers in diverse situations reflect on perceptions of their experiences and maintain ongoing written documentation in portfolios.

Assessment centers and portfolios take different approaches to the same issue--what is "good" in teaching tends to depend on the decision made within each situation. Assessment centers attempt to present standard situations in which teachers' performances will be observable for assessment. Portfolio procedures, on the other hand, attempt to document teachers' diverse situations and performances, and responses to those situations. Assessment centers and portfolio procedures have different strengths and weaknesses, and they can be combined usefully in an comprehensive assessment system.

The portfolio idea is borrowed from other fields--architecture, for one--and cannot be adopted literally. Rather, it must be reconstructed for the teaching profession. As the project developed, we kept in mind that portfolios might serve several purposes, including becoming a significant factor in personnel decisions, teacher development, formation of professional agreements and school reform. Each purpose placed somewhat different demands on the portfolio.

In developing portfolio procedures to test in the initial year, we considered a range of organizational modes for portfolio construction. For example, teachers who are composing portfolios might be guided by an organization's formal instructions, by informal traditions that could be promoted by preparatory or continuing education of teachers, or by various combinations of the two sources. Useful documentation of teaching and teaching situations could be constructed by the teacher working alone, by the teacher working with a colleague or supervisor, or by the colleague or supervisor.

When the options for guidance and for constructing documentation are considered together, quite different images of "portfolio" emerge. In one image, the portfolio is a place to keep and work on materials related to a teacher's efforts to teach better. In another image, the portfolio is a display, for external evaluation, of a teacher's best efforts to teach in a variety of situations. There is some tension between these images; how it should be resolved is not yet clear.

We prepared designs for a range of portfolio entries to be tested in the 1989-90 school year. These designs tended to address distinctive teaching tasks, such as unit planning, student evaluation, or teaching a laboratory lesson in biology. One problem we faced was how to be "helpfully vague" in our instructions to teachers. On the one hand, the designs should suggest both what teachers should document and how their entries will be judged. Portfolios should not become simple dumping grounds or scrapbooks. On the other hand, the designs should not push teachers into inflexible molds or mere displays; they should leave teachers considerable latitude to reveal their own practices. Personal reflection and individual selectivity in choosing and arranging portfolio entries were and are encouraged by the universities in the consortium.

Slowly, we are forming an image of how teachers use portfolios. At any one time, a teacher would be documenting and examining one or two aspects of his/her work; over a longer period, the teacher would document many aspects of his/her practice. The resulting sample of work would not be comprehensive, but rather diversified. The portfolio would not represent all the teacher's work, but would represent the teacher's best work (There are, of course, many components of the teaching process that cannot be distilled into tangible evidence that would fit in a portfolio). That portrait might be both rewarding for the teacher and useful for decision making when it is combined with assessments of the teacher (Teacher Assessment Project Newsletter, 1988).

In December 1987, the Wright State University Project Director received an institutional grant to explore participation possibilities in the Stanford Teacher Assessment Project. Meetings and correspondence with the Stanford team resulted in Dr. Shulman formally inviting the OCPD group to enter into a collaborative arrangement with the project. The consortium serves significant numbers of minority students (in particular, Black and Appalachian students) and is one of five institutions selected by Stanford to serve as a field test site for formative evaluation of assessment

prototypes, in particular reviewing their effect on minority students. Other institutions selected include the City College of New York, Florida A & M University, Pan American University in Texas, and the University of Alaska-Fairbanks.

As part of the larger project, the role of the OCPD was to develop and field test the portfolio concept as one means of teacher competence assessment. The consortium has developed, in addition, broader objectives which recognize the portfolio's potential as a self-evaluation and professional growth tool. The project objectives were is to gather and analyze data on the field test which would contribute to the portfolio model development as one method of teacher assessment. This prototype and others will be presented to the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards for their possible adoption as a certification assessment measure. Specifically, we propose to:

a. Provide analyses (individual and cross-comparisons) of portfolio documents, assessing the effects of the following variables on both process and content: race/ethnicity, experience level of the portfolio developer, and demographic setting;
b. Document portfolio contents as to the types of evidence presented;
c. Document participant reaction to the portfolio process; and
d. Generate recommendations on format and components of portfolios deemed to be most useful either as assessment measures or professional development tools.

This research addresses a widely recognized need for new teacher assessment approaches. At the present time, only two types of assessment are commonly used: written examinations testing basic skills and subject matter knowledge (e.g., the National Teachers' Exam), and direct observation of practice. Both assessment means have been the subject of intense criticism. The NTE, in particular, has been demonstrated to show an inadequate match between what is measured and any reasonably adequate conception of how teaching should be represented (Darling-Hammond, 1988). Direct observation carries with it a number of drawbacks, including subjectivity/prejudice of the observer or checklist-type scales which ignore differences in subject matter or age level of students (Shulman, 1986).

Improved assessment methods are one aspect of the larger efforts to improve education at all levels, from the preservice professional education of teachers to the development of merit pay systems. Unfortunately, assessment is too often seen as a "weeding out" tool rather than as a legitimate base for growth and development. Properly oriented, teachers and students can use the portfolio method to analyze their strengths and weaknesses and to develop action plans toward new learning and skill development. The portfolio system appears to hold advantages in that it removes the teacher or student from being the evaluated object and places him/her in the central role of self-evaluator, documentor, and planner of professional development.

RELATED WORK

The most advanced work in the general area of teacher assessment was being conducted by the Stanford Teacher Assessment Project. This project was a major national effort using the best available expert panels to develop and evaluate the assessment prototypes. The consortium's portfolio project was pleased to be an integral part of this state-of-the-art initiative and we drew heavily on the valuable resources facilitated by the collaborative arrangement.

Portfolio development, as it relates to documentation of teacher competence, is a relatively new concept. Four states have experimented with this method: Utah, Florida, Tennessee, and North Carolina. There is little published literature on their experiences, and what does exist is generally only a description of the process used (Terry & Eade, 1983). Systematic data collection on portfolio models are appearing in the research literature. Within the last few years some publications have discussed reflectivity (Shulman and Colbert, 1989), the portfolio development process in general (Oechsle, et al., 1990; Rief, 1990; Mills, 1990; Valencia, 1990; Simmons, 1990; Vavrus, 1990) and its specific uses in teacher education (Shulman, 1990; Watkins, 1989).

ACTIVITIES

The Ohio Consortium plan provided for field-testing of portfolio development at multiple experience levels and in varied settings. Portfolios have been produced by several hundred beginning teacher education students. In addition, personnel at Wright State University have piloted the document with students beginning their student teaching, the final phase of their teacher education program. The portfolios of the beginning teacher education students will be produced by each participating university, which creates demographic diversity. Wright State is a young metropolitan university (largely a commuter campus) which serves a sizeable population of Appalachian and handicapped students. Central State is a historically African-American university in a rural setting that serves both local students and those from the largest urban areas of the U.S. The University of Dayton is a well-established private institution serving a proportionately smaller number of disadvantaged students.

A grant funded at Wright State University has enabled the consortium to effect collaborative arrangements with Stanford to develop the basic project outline and to conduct detailed planning for the exploratory research. Project activities in approximate sequential order included: a complete literature review; contact with known users of portfolio-type documentation; development of orientation materials for participating students, teachers, and mentors; refinement of analysis instrumentation; program participant implementation of portfolio development; collection of data for analysis; data analysis; and a final report.

In the first year, the project involved the compiling of portfolios from approximately 450 participants. From this pool, 60 portfolios (10 from each representative group and consortium

member) were randomly selected for analysis of the variables mentioned in the objectives. Analysis of the first year pilot provided formative assessment data, giving a base for refined procedures, recommended portfolio content and format, and improved training methods for participants. A second field test during academic year 1989-90 used these refinements; similar numbers of participants were involved.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Local evaluation measures involved multiple sources for review. Participants provided written assessments of their experiences, reactions to the portfolio model and the method by which it was conducted. They addressed the following questions:

Did the portfolios promote self-evaluation and growth plans?

What difficulties did you encounter in documentation?

Were the portfolios a method of integrating course work and experience?

A ten-member consortium committee, with a five-member group charged with actual data analysis, has collectively developed a uniform method of portfolio analysis. Throughout this development, there were ongoing contacts with the Stanford team members for technical assistance and coordination with other field test sites and the larger project. Project plans and results of field tests will be shared with the Stanford group to be incorporated into their final recommendations. The Stanford project has its own means of assessment, including review by expert panels.

CONSORTIUM MEMBERS

While personnel at all three universities agreed to employ the categories of portfolio entries, the inclusion of justifications, and the rating scale, the consortium members implemented the portfolio process in different ways. A brief description of each university's approach follows.

THE GREATER DAYTON COMMUNITY

Dayton, Ohio, founded by settlers who ventured up the Miami River from Cincinnati in 1796, is home to approximately 178,000 people. It is part of a larger metropolitan area which includes about 933,500 people in six countries. Dayton is within 200 miles of such major metropolitan centers as Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Louisville, Lexington, Toledo, Cleveland and Detroit. Because of its location, Dayton's businesses community reaches 62 percent of the nation's population and 65 percent of the nation's purchasing power.

Dayton has long been a distinguished center of invention and creativity. It was in Dayton, which calls itself "The Birthplace of Aviation, " that the Wright Brothers conceived their plans for powered flight, and Charles F. Kettering invented the automobile ignition system, the automobile self starter and leaded gasoline.

There are about 1,500 manufacturing firms in the metropolitan area, but much of the city's economic productivity is derived from high-tech products and research and development companies. More than 300 advanced technology and aerospace companies give the Dayton area one of the highest concentrations of aerospace scientists, engineers and technical experts in the world.

The city's diverse racial and cultural labor force represents a healthy mixture of industrial and professional workers. Manufacturing represents about 25 percent of the economy, followed by wholesale and retail with 24 percent, and business services at 23 percent.

The Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is the largest employer in the Dayton area with about 35,200 employees. General Motors and its six divisions are the second largest employer with about 23,000 employees. Nine Fortune 1000 companies are headquartered in Dayton including NCR, The Mead Corp., Standard Register, Robbins & Myers, Huffy, Philips Industries Inc., Reynolds & Reynolds, Duriron and Amcast.

Dayton has had a city manager form of government for 75 years and was the first large city in the United States to opt for this form of governance. Its city council is comprised of five commissioners, with one of them being the mayor. Each of the six counties in the Miami Valley is governed by a county commission.

Dayton also has numerous museums, dance and music organizations, theater troupes including The Dayton Art Institute, Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra, the Dayton Ballet (the second oldest regional ballet company in the nation), the Dayton Opera, and the Dayton Contemporary Dance Company.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE OHIO CONSORTIUM'S PORTFOLIO PROJECTS

Each of the three approaches used by the original OCPD university members has been assessed as to its limitations and strengths throughout the process, even though neither the University of Dayton nor the Central State University has had any students complete the full program as yet. What follows are the descriptions of each program and tentative findings as of January 1991.

CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY MODEL

Central State University is a state-assisted undergraduate institution with a predominantly African-American enrollment of 2,890 students. The university is located about 15 miles from Dayton in a rural area near Wilberforce, Ohio.

Beginning in the Fall Quarter of 1988, portfolio development was instituted as an experimental program and as a project requirement in the entry level Education Foundation course.

Thirty-five first-year students and sophomores were initially enrolled and they produced the first set of portfolios.

To clarify expectations, lectures and discussions focused on the Teacher Assessment Model and the five accompanying categories. Five activities in the education course related to portfolio development and reflection about teaching:

1. Orientation to and discussions of the five categories combined with directions for planning and developing portfolios;
2. Textbook Analysis: five 'project task sheets' directed toward textbook studies and assigned activities in response to critical questions on teacher competence;
3. Small Discussion Groups: requiring reports on teacher competence topics;
4. Library Research: an assignment requiring students to be acquainted with journals in education and to examine and critique the five categories;
5. Portfolio Party: an informal relaxed atmosphere in which to promote a spirit of inquiry, to permit opportunity for sharing, and to prompt interaction among the students and instructor.

While students' reactions to these activities were stimulating and thought provoking, they tended to suggest that many students were motivated by extrinsic rewards in the production of portfolios: "availability of a portfolio to present at an interview for a teaching position" is one viewpoint that was frequently reported. A summary view of the CSU portfolio experience includes the following:

Limitations:
1. Only one faculty member has been involved throughout the study thus far.
2. The study began with a small pilot group of students in their first year of college and first teacher education course:
   A. Results ("product") for graduating seniors not available for four years.
   B. No structured interim mentoring after the first experience in the first year.
   C. No assurance that the pilot group will stay together as a cohort group at the end of their program of study.

Strengths:
1. A "Portfolio Party" mechanism was created to help students exchange ideas and was enthusiastically borrowed by the other two universities as a viable strategy.
2. A type of closure will be achieved in the portfolio development process by the planned linking of the first year course (ED 151) to the capstone course (ED 440) which will be taught by the same faculty member starting in 1991-92.

What remains as a research and curriculum thrust is a continued effort to improve the model and to make portfolio development a requirement for all students in teacher education. Upper division students in teacher education who were not afforded the portfolio experience

continue to make inquiries about portfolio production. The Coordinator of the Special Education Program has instituted portfolio development as a project requirement in all courses.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON MODEL

The University of Dayton is a private Catholic University enrolling approximately 6,500 undergraduate students. In 1988, the University instituted an experimental program which attempts to integrate the general education courses with foundation teacher education courses. Twenty-three first-year Elementary Education students were enrolled in the experimental program. These students were asked to develop portfolios and continue the process throughout their four years of undergraduate education using the guidelines described above. Portfolios were not part of the course requirements. However, students were assigned an advisor/mentor who met with each student to review the content and organization of the portfolios.

Students were told that they would meet with their advisor/mentor at least once every year to evaluate the portfolios and to assess the individual student's progress toward becoming a teacher decision maker. They were also informed that their portfolios would be used in the required capstone education course, The Philosophy of Education, as a basis for reflecting on the purposes and means of education as a final assignment. This statement will become the final entry in their portfolio and the basis upon which the student will be evaluated.

A variety of early observations about student performances are available at this time.

Limitations:

1. The prime initial faculty participant moved into central administration at the start of the third year of the pilot group.
2. The pilot was initiated with only a small group of students, all of whom were in their first year of Teacher Education:
    A. Results ("product") for graduating seniors are not available until the end of the fourth year of the project.
    B. No structured interim mentoring after the first-year experience.
    C. Students not back together as a cohort group until final semester just before graduation.

Strengths:

1. As of 1990-91, three additional faculty members are involved.
2. A central administrator (Associate Provost) is now knowledgeable and experienced about the portfolio project.

Initially, students seemed most interested in the portfolio products as providing them an advantage in applying for a teaching position. However, the discussions between student and mentor about the portfolios have resulted in significant dialogues about the student's work and its relationship to the categories suggested for the organization of the portfolios. For example, one student had written a paper for an English course on metaphors used in Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Had a

Dream" speech. She reflected that her paper could fit two categories: her command of subject matter and her awareness of the teacher's professional responsibility to various ethnic and minority groups. On the other hand, there were instances in which students failed to see relationships between the categories or between the categories and their present work and career plans.

Two other noteworthy results are that students not enrolled in the experimental program have heard about the project and have begun to inquire about the possiblity of getting help in developing their own portfolios. Faculty not engaged in the program but who serve as mentors/advisors (including faculty in Arts and Sciences) have begun to inquire about the possibility of using portfolios.

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY MODEL

Wright State University is a metropolitan state-supported university dedicated to the educational, social, and cultural needs of the Dayton area with an enrollment of approximately 17,000 graduate and undergraduate students.

Portfolio development began at Wright State in the fall of 1988 as a department-wide endeavor. The two areas in which it was formally introduced were:

1) Phase I--Foundations of Education: In this program phase, the beginning teacher education student is enrolled in introductory education course-work.
2) Phase III--Practicum: In the final phase the students complete student teaching and take their last education course, "The Teacher in School and Society." In this course the portfolio is employed as an assessment tool for the students.

In between, methodological course work is accomplished in Phase II, and faculty members continue portfolio development in this phase with students who have completed the portfolio introduction in Phase I.

During each of the two Phase I quarters, students take two foundations of education courses, and a mentoring concept is built into Phase I. One field experience occurs before the student's first term starts and lasts one week, during which the student spends full days with a cooperating teacher in the public schools. During the two quarters which follow, the student spends a half day per week with the same teacher. The "phase" design permits mentoring throughout the four-course sequence, and a mentoring professor may instruct all four courses.

During the 1988-89 school year, 225 students received an introduction to the teacher assessment project and an explanation of the portfolio requirement. Five beginning teacher education student groups began portfolio development in the Fall of 1988. Approximately 60 students started the Phase I program in the Winter and Spring terms. The students typically attend

the university on a full-time basis, range in age from 18 to 60 (with the majority being 20 to 29 years of age) and are predominantly European-American, middle class commuter students.

The portfolio construction was assigned as a class requirement and received a point value of 10 to 30 percent of the total course grade. A mini-lecture introduced the project in each class and prepared written materials explained the procedure. Explanations on the handout were explicit (e.g., use of a three ringed binder, put your name on the cover, include reflective statements and organize the content around Shulman's five elements). Students were encouraged to include photos and tapes as well as work with assignments from other courses. Professors stressed the necessity for individual creativity. Portfolio questions and discussion occurred routinely throughout the two terms. The quality of portfolio products improved as samples became available and the university supervisors completed training in portfolio construction.

At the end of each quarter the portfolios received a "mentor review" with the evaluation centering on general adherence to the prescribed criteria, especially the reflective statements. The mentors used the portfolios during the student/mentor conference held in the last 10 days of the term. The portfolio became an unanticipated asset for these conferences. Students used the portfolio as an analytical tool for their efforts and found the portfolio activity useful in connecting life experiences to undergraduate education.

A survey questionnaire to Phase I students was administered in June 1989, the first questionnaire went to 133 students, 22 percent of whom were males and 78 percent females. Ninety-three percent of the students indicated the portfolio assisted in reflecting on the teacher's role, with only 7 percent responding neutrally and 0 percent negatively. When asked if they viewed the portfolio as useful in professional growth, 56 percent responded neutrally, 44 percent found it profitable and 0 percent responded negatively. From the participants' clarifying comments it was evident that their short period within the teacher preparation program limited the extent to which reflection on teaching had developed. As one participant remarked, "the portfolio has helped me see how much growth I need to do from now until I graduate."

Respondents also were asked if the portfolio aided in clarifying the criteria (for example, if the portfolio aided in clarifying professional responsibility). The second type of question asked participants to estimate proficiency in the given area. In the "professional responsibility" area, 75 percent of the respondents felt that the portfolio aided in clarifying teaching responsibilities, with the majority of respondents (74 percent) stating that they were neutral in their proficiency in this area. The majority of the participants responded neutrally in regard to the portfolio helping to clarify subject-content knowledge. But 89 percent of the respondents rate themselves proficient in this category.

Students unanimously agreed that use of the portfolio did little in clarifying content-specific pedagogy. These responses were expected since Phase I does not develop methodological

content. However, 90 percent of the students viewed the portfolio as helpful in clarifying classroom management and organization tasks. Ninety-two percent rated themselves as not proficient in this area. The majority of the responses for the portfolio as an aid in classroom organization were concerned with field-related activities. These were designed to have students reflect on their observations in the schools and make plans for professional growth. Clearly the assignment requesting them to observe and respond to organization promoted reflectivity.

Similarly, the portfolio was viewed as helpful in clarifying student-specific pedagogy (75 percent in agreement) with 75 percent of the respondents scoring neutral in proficiency. Again, Phase I course work involves activities focusing on child pedagogy. Overall 89 percent of the respondents rated the portfolio development exercise profitable in developing professional competence.

Another element of the WSU project involved Phase III, Student Teaching. Instructors began portfolio construction in the Fall of 1988. In that academic year approximately 240 student teachers constructed portfolios (100 Fall Quarter, 30 Winter Quarter and 110 Spring Quarter). Student teaching occurs as the terminating experience in the pre-service program and the teacher education faculty believed it in the best interest of graduating students to have exposure to portfolio development. The portfolio was constructed and introduced as part of an evolving role. A seminar by the Phase III coordinator introduced the portfolio project, stressing the advantage of having a portfolio available for the job interview process. Photos and tapes, sample lesson plans, teaching units, student feedback reports, critical incident resolutions and other teaching evidence were suggested for inclusion. Students received no formal feedback on their portfolios.

The data do not lead to clear conclusions at this time, but we believe both students and faculty developed new professional skills during this project. Through faculty portfolio discussion the following changes were introduced for the 1989-90 academic year: (1) Because courses which required reflective activities contributed to reflective portfolio entries, Phase I faculty reevaluated their course requirements to highlight reflectivity. (2)Since a portfolio is not a scrapbook, mediated thinking must be included with each entry and students need assistance in developing this type of entry. Phase I courses and conferences have been suggested to foster higher level thinking skills. (3)Phase III student teacher supervisors were asked to work more closely with students and two sessions of the weekly seminar were devoted to the portfolio process.

For the 1989-90 year the WSU Teacher Education Department officially included portfolio development in all three phases of the teacher education program. Phase II (the methodological phase) started initial inclusion the previous year, with full involvement in 1989-90. Phases I and III refined the portfolio procedures followed in the start-up year. At this writing early in 1991, the following summary outlines Wright State's portfolio project:

Limitations: 1. Inconsistent emphasis on the process of portfolio development among the introductory foundations faculty (Phase I).

2. Many Phase II (methods, classroom management, evaluation, etc.) courses did not correlate the portfolio process of reflection and development to course content on a consistent basis--spotty coordination.

Strengths: 1. A number of faculty members in all three years (Phases) of the teacher education program have been involved.

2. All students in Phases I and III (student teaching), including those at the University's Lake Campus in Celina, Ohio, are now required to initiate and then complete a portfolio.

3. Nearly 625 students have completed a portfolio to date, although only about half of them have worked on the process throughout their teacher education program. Most of the others did not start their portfolio development process until late in Phase II when they made application for student teaching (Phase III). This has provided an opportunity to initiate studies of the use/non-use of the actual documents during the job-search process and the perceptions of these alumni regarding both the process and the product.

We believe the portfolio development project has added a new and exciting dimension to the teacher education program at Wright State University. Continued faculty and administrative support will provide impetus for further installation of portfolio infusion in pre-service education.

An added dimension to the portfolio project involved the Educational Administration area in 1990-91. The Department of Educational Leadership has committed three faculty members to assist in developing guidelines for administrative review of portfolios. The main focus is to develop a process for use of portfolios for selection and retention of entry year teachers. The portfolio content can be used as part of a process to assess a prospective teacher's growth, subject matter knowledge, professional attitude, content mastery, classroom organization skills and student specific values. We see potential in the portfolio process for assisting administrators with staff selection and development.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development is in its third year of collaboration in developing reflective practitioners through the use of portfolios. During this time members have met monthly for planning, the sharing of individual activities, and evaluation. They have participated in meetings of the national consortium initiated as part of the Teacher Assessment Project to consider the special assessment needs of America's minority teachers whether they be

native teachers from Alaska, Hispanics, African-Americans or other cultural groups. Over 800 students, both graduates and undergraduates, at the three teacher education institutions involved in the consortium have participated in the development of portfolios. Some of these students have graduated and are now beginning teachers in the entry year program in Dayton. Experienced teachers in this system have also constructed portfolios during this time. How do these participants evaluate their experience as portfolio constructors?

As the project began, all involved experienced some confusion as there were no models to follow. Individual faculty developed guidelines for their students, but their own understanding of the purpose of the portfolio was minimal. Students were uncertain as to what was expected of them. Those who were getting a grade wanted more guidelines; those whose participation was voluntary felt freer to experiment. Standards evolved ex post facto once the first student portfolios were submitted. When sample portfolios from each institution were reviewed by the OCPD it was evident that there was variety in how students solved the problem of constructing portfolios. At the same time, portfolios were similar enough so that it was not necessarily possible to tell which institution the students attended by the content of their portfolios.

Students felt positive about the experience once it was completed. They expressed a sense of satisfaction at having solved a complex and ambiguous problem. Those who generally do not do as well on paper and pencil tests felt they had a better shot at presenting themselves in a positive light. Although the level of reflectivity in first-year students and sophomores was not always high, many appreciated the opportunity for reflection that the portfolio provided. For some, it helped to recognize the contribution liberal arts courses made to their development as a teacher and to visualize the total college experience in their professional preparation.

Those students who started portfolios during their student teaching (and, for most, their last undergraduate) term felt very strongly that they should have been required to do portfolios throughout the program. The added stress of creating a portfolio during this final quarter of student teaching was a heavy burden to them.

Many students saw the portfolio giving them a competitive edge in the job search. One anecdote seems to confirm this view. The Director of Laboratory Experiences at Wright State University received an out-of-state call from a school district personnel director saying that he had interviewed one of our students and initially was moderately impressed. At the end of the interview, the student applicant had produced his portfolio. The personnel director looked through it and was greatly impressed by the student's initiative and by the portfolio itself. He offered him the job. It remains to be seen whether he will still be impressed when confronted with 50 to 100 portfolios from which to select candidates. It is clear that interviewers will need to be helped to understand how portfolios can be useful to them in the interviewing process and what advantages portfolios may have. As teacher educators, we need to listen to school administrators as they tell

us what kinds of documentation they find most useful for their purposes. This issue received further attention in 1990-91 as graduate faculty from the Wright State Educational Leadership Department joined the consortium to help frame the administrator's role in the portfolio process.

As the "product" component of the portfolio process has evolved, it became apparent that there is a need for students to summarize their portfolios for busy central office administrators and principals to use in the employment process. A January 1991 meeting of the Dayton Area Superintendents Association (DASA) included a brainstorming session on the mechanics of portfolio review by administrators for hiring purposes. There was widespread enthusiasm for the creation of an "executive summary" to allow students to provide a concise overview of their portfolios (see Chart 1). Since this component of the portfolio process has not yet been adopted, the reader is encouraged to suggest revisions and/or additions to the authors.

If school districts believe that portfolios can help teachers to become more reflective practitioners, they need to include teachers and the teachers' union in the overall development of the project from the very beginning. The issue of who will keep portfolios and how they will be used will be a sensitive one.

If districts decide to use the very detailed Stanford TAP model for structuring in-depth portfolios, then they should probably target experienced teachers and not beginning teachers. Beginning teachers could not devote the time to highly structured portfolio construction during their already stressful first year. For experienced teachers it can provide a very stimulating opportunity to reflect on their teaching experience.

Those institutions where a commitment was made by a total faculty or where the department chair or dean strongly supported the project seemed to enjoy greater consistency in the products. Some mentors found the portfolio a good vehicle for mentor/student interactions. Many portfolios included autobiographies which helped faculty to know their students better and to see them as multi-dimensional.

Consortium members recognize that they have only made a beginning in helping their students become more reflective, but all agree that the portfolio has enough promise to warrant a continued commitment. The collaboration itself has been so rewarding that other spin-off ventures have resulted. We are striving to emphasize the personal philosophical, social, and professional development of each teacher-candidate in these programs.

In light of the Educational Testing Service's announcement that it is revamping the National Teacher Exam and that stage three will include an evaluation of portfolios, it behooves us to keep experimenting with portfolio development.

(Chart 1)

Portfolio Executive Summary

(Draft version developed by Charles Ryan and adapted by David Berry)

Name _____, Candidate For Teacher Employment

This executive summary of my teaching Portfolio was prepared using, the criteria provided Phases I, II, and III of the Wright State University (Dayton, Ohio) Teacher Education Program. For each of the criterion I have listed skills acquired as they relate to my professional behavior as a teacher.

DIRECTIONS (to the teacher candidate): Please cite specific behaviors and accomplishments for each criterion in your own words. Limit your remarks to 3 or 4 sentences in a concise paragraph. The executive summary will be a precise description of your strengths as a potential teacher, so it should not exceed two pages in length. Personal and professional reflectivity should infuse your commentary on your work.

Area 1 - Professional Responsibility:

Area 2 - Content Mastery (command of subject matter and content-specific pedagogy):

Area 3 - Class Organization and Management:

Area 4 - Student-Specific Pedagogy:

SUMMARY (a statement of your growth as a developing professional educator in two or three paragraphs):

References

Burnett, D.G. (1985). "Giving credit where credit is due: Evaluating experimental learning in the liberal arts." Innovative Higher Education. 10(1), 43-54.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Clark, G. & Zimmerman, E. (1983). "Identifying artistically talented students." School Arts. 83(3), 22-25.

Curtis, P. and others. (1985). "Documentation of inpatient experiences of resident physicians." Journal of Medical Education. 60(5), 408-410.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). "Teacher quality and educational equality." College Board Review. 148, 16-23.

Elbow, P. & Balanoff, P. (1986). "Portfolios as a substitute for proficiency examinations." College Composition and Communication. 37(3), 336-339.

Entry Year Teacher Program: 1989-90. Proposal submitted to the office of Staff Development of Dayton Public Schools by Anna Mays of the Division of Professional Practice and Research, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

Furtwengler, C.B. (1985). "Evaluation procedures in the Tennessee Career Ladder Plan." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 012)

Mills, R.P. (1990, April). "Using portfolios to assess achievement." Education Digest. 55, 51-53.

Oeschle, L. (1990, Fall). "Portfolios and RN's: An evaluation." Journal of Nursing Education. 29, 54-59.

Putka, Gary. (1989, July). "Education degree isn't a requirement in plan to certify teachers nationally." The Wall Street Journal.

"Reflection: A Proposal." Submitted to the Carnegie Foundation of New York by the Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development, July 1989.

Rief, L. (1990, March). "Finding the value in evaluation: Self-assessment in a middle school classroom." Educational Leadership. 47, 24-29.

Ross, Dorene D. (1989). "First steps in developing a reflective approach." Journal of Teacher Education, 30(2), 22-30.

Shulman, J.H. and Colbert, J.A. (1989, Spring). "Cases as catalysts for cases: Inducing reflection in teacher education." Action Teacher Education. 11, 44-52.

Shulman, L.S.(1990, Spring). "Reconnecting foundations to the substance of teacher education." Teachers College Record. 91, 300-310.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). "Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching" Educational Researcher. 15(2), 4-10.

Shulman, L.S., Haertel E. & Bird, T. (1988). "Toward alternative assessments of teaching: A report of work in progress." Unpublished paper, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Simmons, J. (1990, March). "Adapting portfolios for larges-scale use." Educational Leadership. 47, 28.

Soares, E.J. & Goldgehn, L.A. (1985). "The portfolio approach to business education." Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication. 48(3), 17-21.

Teacher Assessment Project Newsletter. 2(2) Fall-Winter, 1988.

Terry, G.L. & Eade, G.E. (1983). "New Roles for meeting challenges in professional development." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 342)

Valencia, S. (1990, January). "A portfolio approach to classroom reading assessment: The ways, whats, and hows." The Reading Teacher. 43, 338-440.

VanManen, M. (1977). "Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical." Curriculum Inquiry. 6, 205-228.

Vavrus, L. (1990, August). "Put portfolios to the test." Instructor. 100, 48-50.

Watkins, B.T. (1989, July). "Researcher nears climax of 4-year project to evaluate schoolteachers." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 35 A3.

Zenoff, E.H. & Barron, J.A. (1983). "So you want to hire a law professor?" Journal of Legal Education. 33(3), 492-510.